

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 and 15-19 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 14 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, the specification and claims 7, 12-13 and 15-17 are amended and new claims 18 and 19 are added.

The Office Action objects to the disclosure because of informalities. It is respectfully submitted that the above amendments to the specification obviate the grounds for objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0035515 to Moreno. The Office Action also rejects claims 1, 2, 6-11 and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by U.S. Patent 6,344,796 to Ogilvie. Still further, the Office Action rejects claims 3, 4 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ogilvie in view of U.S. Patent 5,223,829 to Watanabe. The Office Action also rejects claims 5 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ogilvie in view of U.S. Patent 5,774,053 to Porter. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites features relating to at least the return of goods. That is, independent claim 1 recites a plurality of kiosks, where each kiosk has a data/receiving part connected to the server network for receiving information on the statement of the goods delivery generated from the server network and for sending information on the statement of the goods returned. See, for example, paragraph 134 of the present application disclosing one non-limiting embodiment of the present specification.

The applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features. That is, Moreno discloses a locker system coupled to a controller 116 over a communication link 114 as well as a server 112 to provide centralized implementation of data and content from a database 108. The

system 100 may enable consumers and vendors to specify parameters, features and functions related to delivery and storage via appropriate internet connections or direct connections. See page 2, paragraphs [0019] and [0020]. Moreno also discloses that upon delivering or picking up the goods in the locker, the system notifies the server 102 and the customer of goods delivery/pick-up. See paragraph [0066].

Ogilvie discloses multiple storage devices that may be enclosed within a fence area. The delivery agent may transport a package to the area and place it in the most convenient bin and enter a delivery code onto a local lock controller panel. A central operations center may recognize the package as one that was expected to be delivered and match the package code to the customer order based on the delivery code. A notification may be sent to the customer that their package has arrived. See column 6, lines 6-46.

However, the applied references do not teach or suggest the plurality of kiosks where each kiosk has a data sending/receiving part for sending information of a statement of the goods returned as recited in independent claim 1. That is, Moreno and Ogilvie, either alone or in combination, do not suggest all the features relating to a data/receiving part for sending information on the statement of the goods returned. The Office Action does not appear to have addressed these specifically claimed features. Thus, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Furthermore, independent claim 7 defines patentable subject matter for at least similar reasons. Independent claim 7 includes features previously recited in dependent claim 14. That is, independent claim 7 recites if the customer requests return of the goods through the kiosk installed at the place designated by the customer, the kiosk operates by requesting to input at

least one of customer information, goods receiving date and goods name, confirming the server network, which has sold the corresponding goods, based on the input information, and transferring information of a statement of goods return and information of the place, where the corresponding kiosk is installed, to the confirmed server network. The applied references of Moreno and Ogilvie, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest these features. Thus, independent claim 7 defines patentable subject matter.

Still further, independent claim 15 defines patentable subject matter for at least similar reasons. Independent claim 15 includes features previously recited in claims 7 and 15. That is, independent claim 15 recites specific features such as requesting the customer to select the place to which the goods are returned, transferring a statement of return of the corresponding goods to the kiosk, continuously confirming by the kiosk whether or not the corresponding goods are returned based on the statement of return received from the server network and notifying the fact that the corresponding goods are returned. The applied references of Moreno and Ogilvie do not teach or suggest these features. Thus, independent claim 15 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 1, 7 and 15 define patentable subject matter. Claims 2-6 and 18-19 depend from claim 1, claims 8-14 depend from claim 7 and claims 16-17 depend from claim 15 and therefore define patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims set forth features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

For example, dependent claim 18 recites if a controlling part of each kiosk receives a request of a return of the goods, then the controlling part transfers information of the retrieved

goods to the server network. Dependent claim 19 depends from claim 18 and further recites that a sensor part determines that the goods are placed in the goods custody part during a returning process and prior to the controlling part transferring information of the returned goods to the server network. For similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest these features.

Still further, dependent claim 5 recites a temperature measuring sensor and a temperature controlling means operated for changing the inside temperature of the goods custody part measured by the temperature measuring sensor and the custody temperature of the inside of the goods custody part based on the kind of the goods kept in the goods custody part. The applied references including Porter do not teach or suggest the claimed controlling means as recited in independent claim 5. Similarly, dependent claim 12 recites confirming a range of proper custody temperature of the goods if the goods are food stuff and operating temperature controlling means for keeping the goods in custody within the range of proper custody temperature. For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references including Porter do not teach or suggest all the features of dependent claim 12. Thus, these dependent claims define patentable subject matter at least for these additional reasons.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-13 and 15-19 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **David C. Oren**, at the telephone number listed below.

Serial No. 09/925,407
Reply to Office Action dated April 16, 2004

Docket No. K-0312

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK:DCO/kah
Date: August 16, 2004

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610